CERTIFICATION STANDARDS & PRACTICES ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING
THURSDAY & FRIDAY, OCTOBER 23-24, 2008

Thursday, October 23 – Starting at 12:00

Room 383
Gallagher Business School
University of Montana
32 Campus Drive
Missoula, Montana 59801

JOINT LUNCH with CSPAC and DEANS – Provided by University of Montana Food Services

JOINT COUNCIL OF DEANS/CSPAC MEETING – Starting at 1:15

ITEM 1 **CSPAC UPDATE – Dr. Douglas Reisig**

ITEM 2 **COUNCIL OF DEANS UPDATE – Dr. Larry Baker and Dr. Lynett Zuroff**

ITEM 3 **CHAPTER 57 UPDATE – Ms. Elizabeth Keller, OPI and Mr. Pete Donovan**

ITEM 4 **OPI UPDATE – Dr. Linda Vrooman Peterson, OPI**

ITEM 5 **OTHER ITEMS**

Friday, October 24 – Starting at 8:30 A.M.

Room 110

School of Education

University of Montana

32 Campus Drive

Missoula, Montana 59801

CALL TO ORDER

A. Call to Order – Dr. Douglas Reisig
B. Roll Call
C. Approval of Agenda
D. Approval of the July 24, 2008 Meeting Minutes
E. Correspondence

ITEM 1 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT – Dr. Douglas Reisig and Ms. Melodee Smith-Burreson

A. Review of CSPAC/ Deans Joint Meeting
B. Committee Appointments
C. Sign Language Interpreters' Standards Workgroup Update

ITEM 2 ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER'S REPORT – Mr. Pete Donovan

A. Meetings Attended
B. Montana Initiative: Math and Science Teachers
C. Amendment of Bylaws

ITEM 3 EXECUTIVE SECRETARY'S REPORT – Mr. Steve Meloy

A. Board of Public Education Report
B. Distance Learning Update

ITEM 4 PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION COMMITTEE REPORT – Dr. Mary Susan Fishbaugh and Ms. Tonia Bloom

A. COEC Summit
B. MEA-MFT Forum – Attended by Dr. Fishbaugh, Dr. Reisig, Ms. Woodhouse, Ms. Muir & Mr. Donovan

ITEM 5 MONTANA COMMISSION ON TEACHING COMMITTEE – Ms. Melodee Smith-Burreson and Ms. Judie Woodhouse

A. Mentor Teacher Permissive Special Competency – Presented by Dr. Jayne Downey
B. Suggested Timeline for Setting Mentoring Programs in School Districts – Presented by Ms. Nikki Sandve

ITEM 6 GOAL SETTING

ITEM 7 PLAN FOR FUTURE CONFERENCES

A. Western States Certification Conference
B. NASDTEC Professional Practices Institute

ITEM 8 FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

A. Draft Annual Report
B. Review Code of Ethics

ITEM 9 PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF CSPAC

ADJOURN

CERTIFICATION STANDARDS & PRACTICES ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

THURSDAY, JULY 24, 2008

Front Street Learning Center
815 Front Street
Helena, MT

CALL TO ORDER

CSPAC Chair, Dr. Douglas Reisig, called the Certification Standards and Practices Advisory Council meeting to order on Thursday, July 24, 2008 at 8:30 A.M. CSPAC council members present were: Chair, Dr. Douglas Reisig, School Administrator, Missoula; Ms. Melodee Smith-Burreson, Teacher, Missoula; Ms. Tonia Bloom, Trustee, Corvallis; Ms. Patty Muir, K-12 Specialist, Laurel; Ms. Judie Woodhouse, Teacher, Polson; Dr. Mary Susan Fishbaugh, Dean of Education, Montana State University-Billings; and Ms. Sharon Applegate, Teacher, Kalispell. Staff members present were: Mr. Peter Donovan, Administrative Officer for CSPAC; Mr. Steve Meloy, Executive Secretary for the Board of Public Education; and Ms. Anneliese Warhank, CSPAC Administrative Assistant. The following people signed the meeting roster: Ms. Elizabeth Keller, Office of Public Instruction; Mr. Bud Williams, OPI; Ms. Kim Warrick, OPI; Mr. Larry Nielsen, MEA-MFT; Mr. Marco Ferro, MEA-MFT; Mr. Bob Vogel, MTSBA; Ms. Nikki Sandve, OPI; Dr. Marsha Davis, Lewis & Clark County; Dr. Linda Vrooman Peterson, OPI; Dr. Mike Miller, U of M Western; Ms. Katie Moore, OPI; Mr. Dale Kimmet, OPI; Mr. Jean Howard, OPI.

Dr. Reisig began the meeting by introducing Ms. Sharon Applegate and Ms. Patty Muir to the Council. Ms. Applegate is the new K-8 teacher, and Ms. Muir is the new K-12 specialist for the Council. He also noted Dr. Fishbaugh had been reappointed for a second term to the Council as the higher education member. Dr. Reisig then presented a PowerPoint discussing all the hard work teachers put into their schools and children as a thank you to Ms. Warrick and all the other teachers on the Council and in the state.

> **Motion: Ms. Judie Woodhouse moved to approve the agenda. This was seconded by Ms. Melodee Smith-Burreson. Motion was unanimously approved.**
>
> **Motion: Ms. Melodee Smith-Burreson moved to approve the March 5-6, 2008 CSPAC Joint BPE meeting minutes. This was seconded by Ms. Judie Woodhouse. Motion was unanimously approved.**

Mr. Donovan went over the correspondence which consisted of the welcome and re-welcome letters to Ms. Muir, Ms. Applegate, and Dr. Fishbaugh. A thank you letter from the Board to Dr. Reisig for his presentation at the joint meeting on March 6, 2008 was

next. Finally, an article discussing the rising number of fraudulent diploma mills in the nation was discussed.

INFORMATION ITEMS
***Items are in the order they were discussed at the meeting.**

ITEM 1 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT – Dr. Douglas Reisig and Ms. Melodee Smith-Burreson

Election of officers:

> **Motion: Ms. Judie Woodhouse moved to elect Dr. Doug Reisig for chairperson of CSPAC. This was seconded by Ms. Tonia Bloom. Motion was unanimously approved.**
>
> **Motion: Ms. Judie Woodhouse moved to elect Ms. Melodee Smith-Burreson for vice-chairperson of CSPAC. This was seconded by Ms. Tonia Bloom. Motion was unanimously approved.**

It was decided the Council wait until a future meeting to determine committee appointments. Fall conferences listed are: MEA-MFT's Education Forum set for September 26, 2008, in Helena; MSU-Billings' Education Summit set for September 19, 2008, in Billings; and OPI's Montana Mentor Institute set for August 12-14, 2008, in Billings. The Council members discussed the calendar dates for the meetings for the upcoming year. The tentative dates decided are:

- Wednesday-Thursday, October 9-10, 2008 in Missoula (**NOTE**: date has been moved to October 23-24, 2008)
- Thursday, January 15, 2009 in Helena
- Wednesday-Thursday, March 11-12, 2009 in Helena with Board of Public Education
- Thursday, July 23, 2008 in Helena

The Council agreed to maintain the five general goals they currently have. Dr. Reisig noted the Council is now working on Sign Language Interpreters Standards for the state. The Council has also completed its work on the review of Chapter 57 with OPI. Finally, the Interpreters' Workgroup highlights were provided for the Council members to review, the next Interpreters' Workgroup meeting will take place August 13, 2008 in Helena.

ITEM 2 BOARD OF PUBLIC EDUCATION REPORT – Mr. Steve Meloy

Mr. Meloy discussed the Legislature's interest in the Board. The Legislative Financial Division would like to see a new strategic plan from the Board. The Legislature would also like to see 100% of Montana's schools meet the accreditation standards. The Interim Committee is also working with the Board, the Board of Regents, and the Office of Commissioner of Higher Education and has developed the K-12 Committee to create a shared vision statement by 2009. The K-College Workgroup is working to incorporate

more science and math into elementary school curriculum. Dr. Peterson came to the table on behalf of OPI to talk about accreditation and what options schools in deficiency have to correct deficiencies. Mr. Meloy then spoke about the strategic planning session the Board had held at their July meeting to revise the Board's mission and goals. Potential goals include better standards, improving the quality of education, better Board leadership, and an increase in student achievement. He also informed the Council about the increased number of cases the Board office had received in relation to revocations and suspensions of educator licenses. The increase in cases has also caused an increase in costs of legal fees. He gave a brief overview of each case and how much the Board has spent per case. Dr. Peterson took this time to introduce three new specialists at OPI. Ms. Katie Moore was hired as the Science Curriculum Instruction Coordinator; Mr. Dale Kimmet was hired as the Accreditation Alternatives Specialist; and Mr. Jean Howard was hired as the Math Curriculum Specialist. Mr. Meloy concluded with the Class 8 License update. The hearing for the proposed rule has been set for August 26, 2008, at 1:30 p.m. in the OCHE conference room. This will be the last opportunity for people who wish to comment on the proposed rule to speak. The rule implementation date, if everything passes, is set for September 26, 2008. One administrative piece still needs to be implemented for the qualification of applicants. Mr. Meloy asked the Council if they would be interested in being the review committee for the rule. The Council was very receptive to the idea and decided to discuss this possibility at a later date. The Board also needs to make sure they wouldn't be stepping outside legal authority by giving this role to the Council.

ITEM 3 ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER'S REPORT – Mr. Pete Donovan

Mr. Donovan presented to the Council all the meetings he had attended since the March meeting. Some of the meetings mentioned included his meeting with the new Board of Regents Student Representative, Mitch Jessen. Mr. Donovan was pleased to announce Mr. Jessen, a student at U of M Western, is an education major who would love to teach in Montana some day. Ms. Keller and Ms. Warrick came up from OPI to discuss the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification Conference. Both Mr. Donovan and Dr. Fishbaugh attended the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education Clinic in May where the possible union of NCATE and Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) was discussed. Dr. Fishbaugh commented that at the federal level, there should really only be one accreditation entity. Many agreed it would be wise for these two organizations to join.

ITEM 4 MONTANA COMMISSION ON TEACHING COMMITTEE REPORT – Ms. Melodee Smith-Burreson and Ms. Judie Woodhouse

Ms. Smith-Burreson turned the table over to Ms. Sandve and Ms. Keller from OPI to discuss the possibility of creating an area of permissive special competency for teacher mentors. Ms. Sandve spoke about the resources on the OPI website and the possibility of

offering a workshop with MTSBA for mentoring in hopes that school districts will better understand its importance. Dr. Fishbaugh expressed her desire to include higher education in the process and noted MSU Billings has offered seminars for a number of years now. Ms. Keller stated the next step would be to add the necessary language to Chapter 58. Mr. Donovan suggested the Council turn to OPI and the accreditation office to work on the project.

Motion: Ms. Judie Woodhouse moved to charge the accreditation office at OPI to begin work on Chapter 58 Language for Teacher Mentoring. This was seconded by Dr. Mary Susan Fishbaugh. Motion was unanimously approved.

ITEM 5 PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION REPORT – Dr. Mary Susan Fishbaugh and Ms. Tonia Bloom

Dr. Fishbaugh discussed her trip to this year's National Commission on Teaching and America's Future Conference. A big topic of discussion at the conference was the pilot project NCTAF had created with George Washington University and the D.C. Public Schools for a teacher residency program. This program looked at reframing public education with national standards and federal mandates in mind. Those in charge of this program would like to start working with post-secondary education to train educators with these new standards. Dr. Fishbaugh expressed interest in having the program work through Montana schools stating those involved in the previous project had seen great improvements. Ms. Woodhouse and Ms. Smith-Burreson voiced concern saying they had the same intentions the previous year, but no funding was available from NCTAF. Mr. Donovan mentioned many new hires had come onboard in the past year so more resources may be available.

ITEM 6 OPI UPDATE – Dr. Linda Vrooman Peterson - OPI

The new OPI specialists were introduced during the morning so the first item on the OPI update was passed over. Dr. Peterson passed out a PowerPoint presentation titled "Montana Five-Year Comprehensive Education Plan Web Application" (5YCEP) which covered the rule in Chapter 55 ARM 10.55.601, this listed the elements needed for the plan, the project goals, guiding principles, activities, and timeline. By asking each school and school district to submit a 5-year plan, OPI hopes to gather enough data base to cover all the school districts "to promote continuous education improvement for all Montana children." The Professional Educator Preparation Program Standards (PEPPS) update came next. An on-site review schedule for 2008-2009 was passed out. The state will do a joint review with NCATE to ensure appropriate review procedures and rigor for each Professional Education Unit. Highly Qualified Teachers was the last topic and a number of letters between OPI and the Department of Education were handed out. Dr. Peterson said she would like it if she could come forward with these same letters at the fall meeting and explain them in further detail. It was decided to take a closer look at them at the next

meeting. These letters were copies of those written to Mr. James Butler, a part of the Teacher Quality Programs at the US Department of Education. OPI has had ongoing discussions with the Department of Education concerning the establishments of HQT requirements for Special Education. Class 5 Alternative License elementary teachers supposedly are not HQT unless they meet content knowledge requirements of No Child Left Behind before day one of teaching. The Department of Education is also saying education minors cannot count as HQT. Dr. Peterson covered the response letters explaining how they are correcting these problems and how they will provide information to prove we are meeting the requirements and requesting flexibility for the issue with minors. Some of these letters are listed on OPI's website: opi.mt.gov.

ITEM 7 LICENSURE AND ENDORSEMENT REPORT- Ms. Kim Warrick and Ms. Elizabeth Keller - OPI

Ms. Kim Warrick and Ms. Elizabeth Keller came before the Council to present the almost complete, rewritten Chapter 57. Ms. Keller felt the best way of explaining the changes to the chapter would be to skim over the entire document. Ms. Keller went through all the changes and answered questions throughout the explanation.

ITEM 8 MARSHA DAVIS – LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT

Dr. Marsha Davis, the County Superintendent for Lewis & Clark County, presented to the Council *Teacher Retention & Montana 6E School Districts*. The study, originally published in 2002 as Dr. Davis' dissertation, looked at the factors drawing to, and retaining teachers at 6E schools in the state. 6E schools refer to those elementary school districts in Montana with 40 or fewer students. Back in 1999 63.3% of Montana schools were rural and 32.5% of school aged children (K-8) attended these schools. She explained how 98% of 6E school teachers were white, 65% married, and 94% female. Many of these teachers had taught at other schools and had a rural background themselves. Throughout the PowerPoint, Dr. Davis explained how such factors as enjoying rural lifestyles and relationships with students have influenced teachers to stay at these 6E schools. Since Montana is such a rural state, it is difficult for other states to understand the issues rural schools in this state face on a regular basis. Dr. Davis hopes to make these issues better known so that these schools can receive the attention they deserve.

ITEM 9 PLAN FOR FUTURE CONFERENCES

The two upcoming conferences of interest to CSPAC are the NASDTEC Professional Practices Institute (October 29-31, 2008 in Austin, TX) and the Western States Certification Conference (January 6-8, 2009 in St. Louis, MS). Mr. Donovan informed

the Council that if anyone was interested in attending either of these conferences to contact him.

ITEM 10 FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Dr. Reisig stated the CSPAC By-laws will need to be reviewed at the fall meeting. Mr. Meloy informed the Council the state auditors had told the office the By-laws need to state the Council was created by the Board who must also re-recognize the Council. The annual joint meeting with the Montana Council of Deans will also be taking place at the fall meeting in Missoula.

ITEM 12 PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Ferro of MEA-MFT passed out pamphlets for the Montana Educator Forum being held on September 26, 2008 in Helena and encouraged all who could, to attend the annual conference.

ADJOURN

Motion: Ms. Judie Woodhouse moved to adjourn the meeting. This was seconded by Ms. Melodee Smith-Burreson. Motion unanimously passed.

Dr. Douglas Reisig adjourned the meeting at 3:45 P.M.

The Certification Standards and Practices Advisory Council will make reasonable accommodations for known disabilities that may interfere with an individual's ability to participate. Persons requiring such accommodations should make their request to the Board of Public Education as soon as possible before the meeting to allow adequate time for special arrangements. You may write or call: CSPAC, PO Box 200601, 46 North Last Chance Gulch, Helena, MT 59620-0601, (406) 444-6576.

2008 Governor's Award for Excellence in Performance

Nomination Application Form

(may use additional pages)

Individual Nomination:

Employee name (first and last): Peter Donovan

Employee's current position and title: Administrative Officer, Certification Standards and Practices Advisory Council

Department, division, section or unit, and location: Board of Public Education

Employee's current home mailing address:
1805 Paradise Dr.
Helena, MT 59601

Employee's supervisor's name and work telephone number: Steve Meloy, 444-6576

Name of person(s) nominating employee: Steve Meloy, Executive Secretary

Team Nomination:

Team participants' names (first and last):

Team's employees' current positions and titles:

Team department, division, section, or unit and location addresses:

Employees' supervisor's name and work and telephone numbers:

Name of person(s) nominating team:

In 75 words or less explain why the employee or team has been nominated for this award. Focus on one or two specific accomplishments or achievements. The information you provide may be used during the awards ceremony. Pete Donovan was the lead worker for the Board of Public Education in the collaborative process to write language for a Class 8 Post Secondary Dual-Credit teaching license. During the past year he served as president of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Certification. Pete is leading the effort to amend the Board's standards relating to teacher licensure and is assisting in the development of standards for interpreters for Montana's hearing impaired students.

CSPAC Committee Responsibilities And Assignments

(as of July 5, 2007)

Pre-Professional Preparation and Continuing Development:
Professional development, continuing education, mentoring, teacher testing, ESEA (NCLB, HQT), outcome assessment, PEPPS (chapter 58), Title II, online degrees and coursework, NCATE.

Licensure and Endorsement Committee:
Chapter 57, paraprofessionals.

Montana Commission on Teaching:
Mentoring, teacher testing.

Pre-Professional Preparation and Continuing Development

- Dr. Mary Susan Fishbaugh
- Tonia Bloom

Licensure and Endorsement Committee

- Kim Warrick
- Charla Bunker

Montana Commission on Teaching

- Melodee Smith-Burreson
- Judie Woodhouse

Executive Committee

- Dr. Douglas Reisig
- Melodee Smith-Burreson

CSPAC Committees

Pre-Professional Preparation and Development Committee— Charla Bunker

Subjects Listed
Teacher Testing
ESEA
Native American Certification
Outcome Assessment
Title II
Preparation Standards
Online Degrees
NCATE

Licensure and Endorsement Committee— Doug Reisig and Kim Warrick

Subject Listed
Teacher Testing
ESEA
Outcome Assessment
Title II
Online Degree
Paraprofessional
Chapter 57

Montana Commission on Teaching Committee—Melodee Smith-Burreson

Subjects Listed
Teacher Testing
Mentoring

Executive Committee – Doug Reisig

Highlights of the August 13, 2008 Sign Language Interpreters Standards Workgroup Meeting

The Certification Standards and Practices Advisory Council, along with the Office of Public Instruction, called together the Sign Language Interpreters Working Group Meeting on August 13, 2008 at the OPI Certification Building Conference Room, 1201 11th Avenue in Helena, MT. Meeting attendees included: Douglas Reisig, Superintendent of Hellgate Public Schools and CSPAC Chairman; Bonnie, Vice President, Montana Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf; Char Harasymczuk, President, Montana Association for the Deaf; Ashley Hike, concerned Hard of Hearing individual; Connie Hiett, parent of Hard of Hearing Child; Steve Gettel, Superintendent, Montana School for the Deaf and Blind; Pete Donovan, Administrative Officer to CSPAC; Tim Harris, Director of Special Education for OPI; Sandra Van Diessen and Tiffany Harding, interpreters from MRID; and Anneliese Warhank, CSPAC Administrative Assistant.

Overview of Agenda Material – Dr. Douglas Reisig

A copy of the Instructors of Braille Rules CSPAC developed in 2006 was the first document in the agenda packet. The Braille rules were provided to give the group an idea of what the rule will look like when a hearing is conducting to accept it. Next in the packet were the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) standards for the certification of Educational Interpreters in a K-12 environment, and a report from RID discussing the roles and responsibilities of an interpreter. The Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment (EIPA) Guidelines came next. An excerpt from "Meeting the Needs of Students Who Are Deaf or Hard of Hearing" explained the roles, responsibilities, knowledge, and skills of interpreters. The RID exam has four different levels of interpreting skill with level four being the best and most fluent interpreters. A description of the EIPA levels described in detail what an interpreter should be capable of at each level. The following document described the EIPA Performance Test and the EIPA Written Test and Knowledge Standards. With these standards in mind, the group looked at the K-12 State Standards for Educational Interpreters. Most states who listed standards required either a 3 or a 3.5 with New Mexico and Alaska requiring a 4. The group all agreed it would be wise for us to looks at standards from surrounding states due to similar demographics. A position paper from Idaho, and one from New Mexico, were included in the packet. The final section of the packet included job descriptions for interpreters from Missoula County Public Schools, MSDB, Livingston Public Schools, and for the Coordinator of Deaf/Hard of Hearing Services.

Additional Material Discussion – Mr. Pete Donovan

Mr. Tim Harris distributed a list showing the Special Education Child Count for the 2007-2008 school year. Although it is not the best score, it was decided a 3.5 would be sufficient enough for a new interpreter. Those present felt it would be wise to request the interpreter show improvement to a higher score within 3 years of the original test date. It was pointed out the best way for someone to improve their score would be through socializing directly with the deaf community. The group was aware that even a 3.5 would be a very high score for some of the current interpreters in the state to reach at this point, so we would have to allow a grace period for everyone to improve. Ms. Christensen mentioned probably 6 interpreters in the state have

taken the EIPA on their own, and about two years should be enough to time for everyone to improve to the 3.5 standard. How much assistance the state should provide was another question. OPI sponsors the test once a year but if a certain score is required they may need to begin offering it multiple times throughout the year. The Montana Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (MRID) is also working on starting up traveling workshops with instructors to enable interpreters to improve their skills across the state. Although MRID and OPI have no connection, the possibility of a partnership would definitely help train and test interpreters throughout the year. Continuing education to improve one's score would be greatly stressed to interpreters who receive a 3.5 on the EIPA, but, as Mr. Gettel stressed, we should require they go through an endorsed entity such as Idaho State University. A district would be responsible to check that an interpreter is certified and has met the minimum score requirements, but it would be up to MRID to keep that information on file.

Discussion of Next Steps

Throughout the meeting Dr. Reisig wrote down notes and read out loud ideas of specific rules to include in the final rule. He stated he would type up a draft form of the rule which the group could review at the next meeting. Everyone agreed to this idea.

Set Date for Next Meeting

The next meeting date has been set for Wednesday, October 8th, from 10 a.m. to 3 p.m. at the OPI Licensure Office, 1201 11th Ave.

Pete Donovan Meetings Attended
07/24/08 to 10/23/08

1.	MEA-MFT Summer Conference	7/29/08
2.	BPE Conference Call (Library Content & Performance Standards)	7/30/08
3.	Kindergarten to College Work Group	7/31/08
4.	Sign Language Interpreters Work Group	8/13/08
5.	Montana Learning First Alliance	8/20/08
6.	NCTAF Conference Call	8/21/08
7.	BPE Hearings on Distance Learning & Class 8 Admin. Rules	8/26/08
8.	K-12 Planning Meeting, OPI	8/27/08
9.	Florida DOE Webex, OPI School Staffing Module	8/28/08
10.	Class 8 Planning Meeting	9/02/08
11.	Chapter 57 Planning Meeting	9/02/08
12.	Risk Management Overview meeting	9/08/08
13.	Insight Schools E-Learning Demonstration	9/10/08
14.	Board of Education Meeting, Pablo	9/11/08
15.	BPE Meeting, Pablo	9/11,12/08
16.	Chapter 57 Review Meeting	9/17/08
17.	Paraprofessional Consortium Meeting	9/19/08
18.	Conference Call on Licensure for School Counselors	9/23/08
19.	Conference Call on Planning for MCEL Presentations	9/23/08
20.	Facilitator Training, Montana Educator Forum	9/25/08
21.	Montana Educator Forum	9/26/08
22.	Montana Learning First Alliance	9/30/08
23.	LFD Meeting on BPE/CSPAC Budgets	10/02/08
24.	Class 8 Licensure Implementation Conference Call	10/02/08
25.	Conference Call on Planning for MCEL Presentations	10/03/08
26.	MSU-Bozeman State Accreditation Review	10/5-7/08
27.	Sign Language Interpreters Work Group	10/08/08
28.	Personnel Sharing Grant Application Meeting	10/09/08
29.	Chapter 57 Planning Meeting	10/09/08
30.	Class 8 Implementation Meeting	10/10/08
31.	MCEL Conference	10/15-17/08
32.	Montana Council of Deans of Higher Education	10/23/08

MONTANA INITIATIVE:
MATH AND SCIENCE TEACHERS
TELECONFERENCE MEETING MINUTES
Friday, 3 October 2008 - 3:00 P.M.
Convener: G. M. Dennison, President

Participants:

The University of Montana:
George M. Dennison, President
Royce Engstrom, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Roberta (Bobbie) Evans, Dean, School of Education
Rick Billstein, Professor of Mathematics
Tricia Parrish, Doctoral Research Assistant

Participants via Conference Call:
Alex Apostle, Superintendent, Missoula County Public Schools
Larry Baker, Dean, College of Education, Health and Human Development, MSU
Maurice Burke, Professor Mathematical Sciences, MSU
Katherine Burke, Science Curriculum Specialist, OPI
Marco Ferro, Public Policy Director, MEA/MFT
Jean Howard, Math Curriculum Specialist, OPI
Jack Kirkley, Professor, EVST, UM-Western
Jan Lombardi, Education Policy Advisor, Governor's Office
Dave Puyear, Executive Director, School Administrators of Montana
Bob Vogel, Director of Governmental Relations, Montana School Boards Association

---

I. Greeting and Introduction: All

II. Overview of the Math and Science Initiative: G.M. Dennison
- Emerged from The National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC).
- "Rising Above the Gathering Storm" – initial report wherein charge to generate "ten thousand additional science and mathematics teachers annually" emerged.

III. Shared Perceptions: All

IV. Proposed Stages of the Initiative: G. M. Dennison. Variable, but probably a multi-year project.
- Data Collection and Analysis. What do we know about the situation?
- Problems, Barriers, and *Opportunities* [per J. Lombardi].
- Proposed Solutions. What are they?
- Plan of Action for Montana.

V. Data Collection and Analysis to Assess Situation in Montana. G. M. Dennison

1. Licenses issued annually. Ask Elizabeth Keller, OPI, to assemble the data and provide to T. Parrish. Data for 3 years if available. Analyze for trends.

   Comments/Suggestions

   - It was agreed that Elizabeth Keller would be instrumental in the collection of this data [All].
   - Add Pete Donovan (CSPAC Administrative Officer) for help in identifying future trends in licensure [Lombardi].

   Charge → Contact Pete Donovan and request his assistance to work collaboratively with E. Keller for the collection of licensure data [R. Evans].

   Update→ R. Evans left message for Donovan 10/06.

2. Annual vacancies. Ask Mike Heuring, UM Director of Career Services, to lead and work with other Directors at other Montana campuses. Data for 3 years if available and with specific regard to number of vacancies by teaching area. Assemble data and provide to T. Parrish. Analyze for trends.

   Comments/Suggestions

   - In addition to information collected from Career Services, the OPI website can be used as a resource http://www.metnet.mt.gov/TPlacement/ [Rud].

   Update →R. Evans confirmed with M. Heuring; work initiated 10/06.

3. Employed teachers with and without license in area of teaching. Ask Madalyn Quinlan (Chief Administrative Officer, OPI), to assemble the data and provide to T. Parrish. Data for 3 years if available. Analyze for trends.

   Comments/Suggestions

   - In addition to contacting Quinlan ask Al McMilin (Accreditation, OPI), for input as he is able to access data on teachers that are currently licensed [D. Puyear].

   Update → As of 10/06

   - R. Evans left message for Quinlan.
   - R. Evans conferred with McMilin who suggested the Steering Committee examines the OPI Recruitment and Retention Reports, which he will provide.
   - Bob Vogel, MTSBA, provided an article titled "Attrition of Public Schools Mathematics and Science Teachers." Copies circulated to members.

4. Annual production by teaching major. Ask David Micus, UM Registrar, to work with colleagues to assemble data for 3 years and provide to T. Parrish. R. Evans and L. Baker to assemble data for projection by working with other relevant deans around the State; provide to T. Parrish. Analyze all data for trends.

   Comments/Suggestions

   - The initiative will be discussed at the Montana Council of Deans of Education [L. Baker].

   Update → Evans confirmed with Micus 10/03.

Suggestions for Future Consideration:

- Possibly conduct a survey among all Montana education associations (MREA, MTSBA, MEA/MFT, MCTM, MSTA). The focus of the survey is to collect data regarding:
  A. The number of years of experience current Montana math and science teachers have.
  B. The number of teachers who will be retiring.
- Assess the number of student teachers who are currently enrolled in math and science education programs throughout the Montana University Systems.
- Consider compiling comparative data regarding the salaries of math and science teachers (K-12) and professionals in the industries [R. Engstrom].
- Improve the level of coordination/collaboration between chairs of the science and math departments throughout Montana University Systems [R. Billstein].
- Locate Dori Nielsen report documenting why teachers left the field [D. Rud].
- President Dennison to distribute information from the NASULGC meeting (11/09 – 11/11) to committee members.
- Proposed solutions to create and foster information exchanges between teachers and university professors [L. Baker].
- Qualitative Components
  - Examine why teachers leave the field – Where do they go? – Why do they go? [B. Vogel].
  - Integrate the voice of the students: What are high school students' career plans? Identify who is interested in going into teaching [J. Howard].
  - Work with the Board of Public Education and recruit student representative for data collection [J. Lombardi].
  - Use the "raw material" collected in the development of this initiative to address the question "How do you bring about a society wide change as we make this shift?" [J. Kirkley].

VI. Next Meeting. G. M. Dennison

Location: Helena
Possible Dates: December 4th – Possible morning meeting, then attend the Math Education Forum [J. Howard].
Early January

(DATE TO BE CONFIRMED PENDING RESPONSES FROM MEMBERS. **SPECIFIC REQUEST TO MEMBERS: Please inform Cathleen Collins about your availability on the morning of 4 December 2008.**)

Tentative Agenda:

- Report of Data Collection and Analysis on Situation in Montana: T. Parrish
- Curricular Structures in Montana Universities: R. Engstrom.
- Problems, Barriers, Opportunities: R. Evans to lead discussion.
- Potential solutions: President Geoff Gamble, MSU, to lead discussion.
- Possible Sub-Committees to flesh out and analyze potential solutions: G. M. Dennison

VII. Adjourn.

The University of Montana

Office of the President
The University of Montana
Missoula, Montana 59812-3324
Office: (406) 243-2311
FAX: (406) 243-2797

15 August 2008

TO:
A. Apostle, Superintendent, Missoula County Public Schools
L. Baker, Dean, College of Education, Health and Human Development, Montana State University
R. Billstein, Professor of Mathematical Sciences, The University of Montana
C. Brewer, Associate Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, The University of Montana
M. Burke, Professor of Mathematical Sciences, Montana State University
I. Davidson, Chairman of the Board, D.A. Davidson
D. Dooley, Provost, Montana State University
R. Engstrom, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, The University of Montana
R. Evans, Dean, School of Education, The University of Montana
M. Ferro, designee, MEA/MFT
J. Kirkley, Professor of Environmental Studies, The University of Montana Western
L. Knight, CEO, First Interstate Bank
J. Lombardi, Policy Advisor for Education, Governor's Office
D. McWhinney, CEO, Washington Foundation
L. Melton, Executive Director, Montana School Boards Association
S. Moore, Deputy Commissioner of Higher Education
A. Myke, President, Montana Science Teachers Association
D. Puyear, Executive Director, Montana Rural Education Association
D. Rud, Executive Director, School Administrators of Montana
R. Thompson, CEO, Semi-Tool
L. Wood, President, Montana Council of Teachers of Mathematics

FROM:
G. M. Dennison, President, The University of Montana
G. Gamble, President, Montana State University
S. M. Stearns, Commissioner of Higher Education
L. McCulloch, Superintendent of Public Instruction

SUBJECT: Science and Mathematics Teacher Commitment in Montana

The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) has proposed a collaborative of member institutions to increase the number, diversity, and quality of science and mathematics teachers prepared annually to meet needs as the nation and the states strive to sustain the desired quality of life and global competitiveness. While no one knows the number for certain, the National Academies in a report issued two years ago estimated that the country will need 10,000 new science and mathematics teachers annually over the next few

years. We do not know the precise number for Montana, but we know that Montana shares in this pressing need. To help address that challenge, we invite you to join us as a member of a planning group to develop more information and outline the plan for a responsive project for Montana. We believe the time has come for action because the need will become more challenging with every passing year. We seek your help to meet this challenge by joining us as a member of the planning group.

For your information, we have attached a copy of the NASULGC position paper describing the national challenge. While the paper requests a commitment to participate, and also suggests some specific strategies, it nonetheless recognizes that one size does not fit all and that each state must decide for itself how to proceed. We in Montana can decide for ourselves the critical issues and actions we deem appropriate. However, we should not, cannot, and will not allow the challenge to go unanswered.

First, we must inform ourselves about the actual and developing need in the State. Together, we can find and analyze the necessary data. Second, we need a straightforward plan of action to address the identified need. We know that such a plan will involve many stakeholders and players, will require great care in execution, and will not come cheaply. However, we also know that failure to address the challenge will prove even more costly.

Any plan this far-reaching in impact will lead to other considerations and concerns as implemented. We will need to find ways to ensure retention of current and future teachers for long-term success. We will have to develop innovative pedagogies and materials to enhance any success we might achieve. We must stand ready and eager to address these and other issues as well.

We intend to schedule a meeting in the next couple of weeks to begin the discussion. Please let us know as soon as possible if you will join us in this critical undertaking by calling Cathleen Collins at (406) 243-2311. Ms. Collins will then find a date and time that works, and we will identify a suitable and convenient place for the meeting.

Thank you very much in advance for your willingness to take on this challenge.

GMD/kc
Denmem2421

Attachment

Science and Mathematics Teacher Imperative

Memorandum

To: NASULGC Presidents and Provosts

Cc: Governmental Affairs
Research Vice Presidents
Public Affairs

From: Peter McPherson

Date: June 2, 2008

Re: Science and Mathematics Teacher Imperative Paper

We are pleased to share the attached discussion paper about preparation of science and mathematics teachers. The paper argues that NASULGC presidents/chancellors and their institutions should make a commitment to the preparation of additional science and mathematics teachers. Such commitments would be in connection with the efforts of others in the particular state. However, the overall conclusion and specifics of the paper are and must be very much open for debate and modification by you. Of course we know many of you are already seriously engaged in teacher preparation, and there are many state and national efforts underway. However NASULGC may be able to add significant and unique value by linking such efforts and to that end we need your feedback on the paper. Again the attached paper takes a clear position but it is intended to get the views of you and your institution.

As you know, addressing the nation's critical need for STEM teachers has been one of NASULGC's major initiatives over the past 18 months with the leadership of Chancellor Herman of the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign and a commission on the Science and Mathematics Teacher Imperative. Acting on a request from Richard last February, the NASULGC Board created a special ad hoc committee of presidents and provosts chaired by President Lee Todd of the University of Kentucky, specifically to consider whether presidents and chancellors ought to be asked to make some form of commitment.

President Todd's committee endorses the attached proposal and recommends serious consideration by presidents and chancellors at their June 10 meeting and by provosts at their NASULGC summer meeting. We hope that you and your campus will continue to be engaged on this matter into the summer and early fall. We will compile your feedback to this paper, and with the assistance of Richard Herman, Lee Todd and his committee, we will revise this paper for consideration. If appropriate we will then make a recommendation for action by the NASULGC Board at the annual meeting in November.

We invite your questions, comments, proposed revisions and of course disagreement. We welcome all communications, and would appreciate if you would also share copies of any feedback with our co-director of the Science and Mathematics Teacher Imperative Charles Coble (ccoble2@nc.rr.com).

Weighing Our Commitment to the Science and Mathematics Teacher Imperative

This paper proposes that presidents and chancellors of NASULGC institutions commit to:

1. *Substantially increase the number and diversity of high quality mathematics and science teachers they prepare;*
2. *Identify the need– both immediate and longer term -- for science and math teachers in their states, working with appropriate state agencies and other universities;*
3. *Build partnerships among universities, school systems, state government and others to collectively address their state needs on a sustained basis.*

In "Rising Above the Gathering Storm," the National Academies' first recommendation is a call for an annual increase of 10,000 mathematics and science teachers in order to maintain U.S. economic standing in a world growing rapidly more competitive. With the shortage of qualified math and science teachers approaching crisis proportions in many states, a commitment by a significant number of NASULGC institutions to address the needs of their states would demonstrate critical leadership and could stimulate other sectors in turn to ramp up their efforts.

As discussed over the past 18 months with both the Council of Presidents and the Council on Academic Affairs, NASULGC, in collaboration with its 218 members and other organizations, has undertaken this initiative to increase significantly the number and diversity of high quality science and mathematics teachers prepared and inducted into teaching. To guide our efforts, NASULGC established a prominent commission of university, industry and education leaders chaired by Richard Herman, Chancellor, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign http://www.nasulgc.org/NetCommunity/Page.aspx?pid=592&srcid=584. *NASULGC augmented its staff with a small expert group and received a planning grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York in October 2007. In March, 2008, the initiative received a grant from the National Science Foundation to assess the specific state-level needs for science and mathematics teachers. Two other proposals have been submitted. The staff has consulted extensively, surveyed the provosts of NASULGC institutions, and began promising collaborations with other education, business, and science societies.*

A ***Special Committee on the Commitment to the Teacher Imperative****, named by the NASULGC Board, endorses a proposal that presidents and chancellors commit their institutions to preparing and developing science and math teachers. The committee recommends for serious consideration by the NASULGC Council of Presidents and the Council of Academic Affairs this discussion paper describing the potential commitment. The Special Committee was formed during the February 2008 NASULGC Board meeting in response to a request by Richard Herman, Chair of the NASULGC Commission for the *Science and Mathematics Teacher Imperative*. The Special Committee consists of 13 presidents and provosts to provide guidance on how NASULGC might stimulate member universities to increase significantly the number and quality of math and science teachers they prepare. Based on feedback from university leaders this summer, we will forward recommendations as appropriate to the NASULGC Board for action during the annual meeting in November.

---

* Presidents: Lee Todd, Chair, University of Kentucky; Erskine Bowles, University of North Carolina System; Robert Bruininks, University of Minnesota; Beverly Edmond, Alabama A&M University; Milton Gordon, California State University, Fullerton; John Simpson, University at Buffalo; Larry Penley, Colorado State University; Nancy Zimpher, University of Cincinnati; Richard Herman, ex-officio, University of Illinois, Urbana Champaign, and Chair of the Commission for the *Science and Mathematics Teacher Imperative*; and Provosts: Barbara Couture, University of Nebraska, Lincoln; Michael Gottfredson, University of California, Irvine; Doris Helms, Clemson University; and John Frederick, University of Texas, San Antonio

The Rationale for a Statement of Commitment

We estimate 150 or more NASULGC institutions undertake some 500 discernible math and science teacher preparation efforts in response to over 25 years of national concern over the decline in U.S. student achievement in pre-college education relative to international competitors. Yet, it does not appear that these efforts are a sufficient response to the nation's critical challenge in providing enough teachers of appropriate quality. (See attachment.) A shared commitment, endorsed by a large number of institutional leaders, would encourage individual institutions and their university systems to take bolder actions and draw strength from the nation-wide momentum. The shared statement could galvanize universities, spurring them to stretch in their objectives recognizing that to increase the number and diversity of high quality math and science teachers will require enhancing partnerships with other sectors in education as well as further attention to undergraduate science and math education. Only the shared commitment endorsed by many leaders could generate sufficient interest and drive from which to consider changes in faculty rewards and incentives for participation in teacher preparation.

Shining such a favorable light on leading state universities emphasizing education at all grade levels could stimulate a complementary higher priority to science and math teacher recruitment, preparation, induction, development and retention by critical partners in state governments, school districts and the private sector. The shared commitment could grant a more potent voice with state and district education leaders in drawing attention to another important issue that is out of direct university control - appropriately compensating teachers.

Business and philanthropic foundations, some already engaged in somewhat disparate efforts in teacher preparation, development and compensation, might be further stimulated by the coherence of a national commitment. Perhaps we could use such a commitment to stimulate the development of broader national efforts with these key partners.

Finally, if we are successful in garnering pledges of concerted and measurable action by a sufficiently broad and large array of leading universities, we would work to translate this into attention and further support of federal agencies, as they develop programs during the early months of the next Presidential administration.

In his request for the formation of this committee, Chancellor Herman noted members of his Commission proposed the idea of a shared statement of university commitment - a "pledge" as one university system Chancellor suggested at the NASULGC Council of Presidents meeting in November, 2007.

Potential Elements of a Commitment

The Commission suggested key strands of a potential commitment by university and system leaders might include:

1. Substantially increase the number and diversity of high quality mathematics and science teachers they prepare;
2. Determine the need – both immediate and longer term -- for science and math teachers in their states, working with appropriate state agencies and other universities;
3. Build partnerships among universities, school systems, state government and others to collectively address their state needs on a sustained basis.

An institutional commitment embodying these three strands would capture many critical characteristics:

- Acknowledge that the situation is a crisis or approaching one in most states, and thus necessitating immediate action;
- Emphasize the number and quality of teachers needed by each state and district;
- Stimulate collaboration among universities, education systems and state governments to assess the need for math and science teachers recognizing it's a shared problem requiring shared solutions to match supply and demand in their own state;
- Incorporate ongoing efforts by institutions/systems and respect the variety of initiatives, funding, and approaches already underway;
- Stimulate the formation of stronger partnerships with local school districts, community colleges and other educational institutions and community entities;
- Allow for a multi-faceted approach to satisfying the demand for math and science teachers, including rigorous non-traditional routes to teacher certification;
- Extend the universities' role and responsibilities in teacher preparation to include the induction and mentoring of new teachers and the ongoing development of experienced teachers
- Dedicate sustained resources – money, people and time -- to the efforts to improve and intensify math and science teacher preparation;
- Include metrics --specific quantifiable goals -- to enable us to demonstrate progress and to stretch institutions and the education community to move beyond their present practices -- significantly increase the number, quality and diversity of teachers they prepare and show results over many years

Challenges to Implementing a Shared Commitment

There are important questions and issues that need to be resolved in the process of defining and implementing a potential statement of institutional commitment. Earlier this decade, institutional leaders made pledges to teacher preparation under the auspices of AAU and ACE. AAU retrieved archived files in order for NASULGC to learn

from and build upon the AAU work. Based in part on discussions with individuals engaged in the AAU effort, NASULGC recognizes that challenges include:

- Sustaining top level institutional attention to an effort sufficiently long to achieve measurable results
- Getting enough institutions to sign on to attract meaningful attention
- Developing and employing a suitable metric such that both individual and aggregate progress can be measured over time
- Commanding sufficient resources from within each institution to make programmatic changes, particularly in difficult economic times
- Enhancing science and math faculty rewards and incentives for teacher preparation, which require some change to very deeply entrenched faculty and institutional cultural norms on the priority of research to scholarship
- Determining how to distinguish and establish the value-added of such an "over-arching" initiative, given how much is already underway
- Leveraging political and financial support from local and state decision makers to sustain the work

Meanwhile, the issue has been amplified by national and state reports citing a continued and growing need for high quality math and science teachers.

Implementation of the Proposed Commitment: a Five-Pronged Strategy

Our implementation would be sustained over many years and we will create a NASULGC entity, such as a new commission, to serve as a hub and convener for these important programs across NASULGC institutions. Our efforts would be organized around five components:

1. *Galvanize higher education leadership to make STEM teacher preparation a higher priority among peers,*
2. *Determine how to assess the need for secondary science and math teachers, recognizing that supply and demand differs from state to state,*
3. *Facilitate state fiscal and policy support and increased cooperation between state policymakers and education leaders,*
4. *Develop the means for institutions to learn from one another's approaches -- an analytical framework which incorporates key components of the most promising practices in science-math teacher recruitment, preparation, mentoring and induction, partnership, and teacher development across universities, and*
5. *Team up with selected national and regional university, science, mathematics, and education groups.*

Should an institutional commitment be adopted, by galvanizing higher education leadership it would become the foundation of our implementation of the teacher imperative, as denoted in the **first prong of our strategy**. The notion of a commitment by several dozen (over a hundred?) major public institutions would draw the attention of potential collaborating sectors, and hopefully with that, prospects for

additional resources for universities attempting to bolster their programs and collaborations. NASULGC would work to build and sustain visibility by:

- keeping track publicly of institutions (and in what states) that sign on;
- marking the progress of committed institutions with aggregate metrics; and
- portraying examples and case studies of programs that are achieving their goals and creating effective state or regional partnerships.

Our **second prong** addresses the challenge facing states to assess their current and projected needs for science and math teachers and the teacher recruitment-preparation-retention pipeline. National estimates of the need for "10,000 additional science and mathematics teachers annually" are rough approximations meant as calls for national action, but they give no guidance for individual states. Similarly, the commitments by a number of universities to double or triple their production of science and mathematics teachers are a strong step in the right direction, but often are not based on true assessments of needs that would ensure these efforts are ultimately on target. In response to this problem, NASULGC has received a grant from the National Science Foundation to devise a resource to help state policymakers and university leaders more accurately determine their science and mathematics teacher demand and supply picture. The resource is intended to include a protocol, based on a review of relevant literature and prior efforts, to help officials frame the appropriate questions and give them guidance in undertaking the kinds of analysis that will afford the most accurate and useful projections of teacher supply and need.

Third, we are developing a project with the Education Commission of the States (ECS) to collaborate with state government and education leaders to identify and develop further leading state models of specific strategies and sustained resources to address needs for science and math teachers.

Fourth, we will develop the means for institutions to learn from one another's approaches to the preparation of math and science teacher preparation. During our anticipated effort, we will:

- compile an analytical framework for viewing and assessing the most promising practices in science-math teacher recruitment, preparation, mentoring and induction, partnership, and teacher development across universities, and
- undertake robust communications among NASULGC and other institutions through meetings and websites to share experiences, approaches and challenges in addressing programs and policies.

Fifth, we will collaborate with selected national and regional university, science and education groups. We have begun to:

- reach out to organizations representing other key sectors, such as the chief state school officers (CCSSO), the Education Commission of the States and the National Governor's Association, to leverage our state university commitments with comparable commitments by their members;
- collaborate with science professional societies in physics, chemistry and math to provide robust opportunities for faculty involved in teacher preparation to learn

from one another and develop ways to deal with institutional and cultural constraints to their further engagement;

- seek foundation and private funding for university programs through collaborations with appropriate funding organizations such as the National Math and Science Initiative (NMSI), Math for America, and the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation; and
- seek state and federal funding through enhanced visibility among state and federal government leaders and programs targeting university teacher partnerships.

ATTACHMENT

Context For The NASULGC Teacher Imperative

Not since the launch of Sputnik, and the fear that the Soviet Union was outperforming the U.S. in science and technology, has the call for America to step up its commitment to mathematics and science education been as loud and persistent as today. Beginning in 1983 with the National Commission on Excellence in Education report, *A Nation at Risk*, and continuing through the turn of the century with the 2000 National Commission on Mathematics and Science Teaching for the 21st Century ("Glenn Commission") report, *Before It's Too Late*, a variety of reports warned that America continues to lose ground in the global competition for scientific and engineering human resources. And it is clear from the international TIMSS and PISA assessments of student learning that U.S. students in general are far behind students in many other countries in having the knowledge of science and mathematics and the critical thinking skills that are the ticket to success for individuals and for the nation's economy now and in the future.

Significantly, most of these studies note the essential role K-12 teachers play in improving their students' math and science competency and, thus, the critical need to ensure that all children have teachers who are sufficiently well-prepared to accomplish the task. The NAS' seminal 2006 report, *Rising Above the Gathering Storm: Energizing and Employing America for a Brighter Economic Future*, cites the intense global economic competition of today's information age and America's declining ability to keep pace. The report notes: "By far the highest leverage to be found in our education system resides with teachers, if for no other reason than that they influence such a large number of future workers." However the NAS cited significant shortages, noting that many school districts hired uncertified or under-qualified teachers. According to the report, a U.S. high school student had only a 40% chance of studying chemistry with a teacher who was a chemistry major and even less in physics. Furthermore, about 2/3 of the nation's teachers are expected to retire in the coming decade, with about 200,000 of them secondary science and math teachers – potentially making matters even worse.

The first of the NAS report's four recommendations– "the 10,000 new teachers for 10 million minds" to significantly improve K–12 science and mathematics education reflected the singular importance of preparing teachers. The report committee presented this recommendation as a higher priority than its advocacy for research funding, graduate education or the environment for innovation.

This first recommendation is the focus of the NASULGC ***Science and Mathematics Teacher Imperative***. As the leading public universities in every state, NASULGC institutions educate, by far, the largest –and probably best prepared – cohort of undergraduate science and engineering students, on research-intensive campuses that house arguably the most influential colleges of education in each state. NASULGC is the best positioned group of institutions to respond to this NAS call by leading the increase in the number and diversity of high quality secondary school mathematics and science teachers prepared by our nation's universities.

Universities Respond – but its not enough

There has been a growing effort among colleges and universities to respond to the shortage by increasing their output of K-12 science and mathematics teachers. A number of individual universities and systems have established ambitious goals in response to their state needs. Among them are the California State system – committing to double the number of science and math teachers prepared, to 1500 annually by 2010; the University of California system – quadruple, to 1000 by 2010; the University of Maryland system, triple by 2013; and similar serious commitments by other universities in North Carolina, Georgia, Arizona, New York, Texas, Louisiana and Florida. The leading UTeach program at the University of Texas Austin, begun about a decade ago in part with an NSF grant, now prepares over 70 math and science teachers annually with some 500 undergraduate students presently in training.

NASULGC institutions are the in the lead in most programs. According to our estimates, based in part on tallies from provosts, more than 150 NASULGC universities participate in more than 500 discernible science and math teacher preparation projects combined, from the National Science Foundation (NSF), Department of Education, National Math and Science Initiative, Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation, Carnegie Teachers for a New Era, Math for America and/or the Physics Teacher Education Coalition. More than 40 NASULGC universities participate in NSF Math and Science Partnership (MSP) projects. Of special note is the new National Math and Science Initiative (NMSI), funded in large part by ExxonMobil, that has announced funding of some 13 institutions, beginning in 2007, for 5 year commitments to replicate the UTeach program on their campuses. NASULGC institutions dominated the ranks of the winning proposals, as they did the over 50 institutions that applied for NMSI matching funds.

Important as these various efforts are, they do not come close to meeting the need for more and better-prepared science and mathematics teachers. For example, *California's Math and Science Teachers: A Critical Path Analysis* by the California Council on Science and Technology and the Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning reported that in California alone "the demand for new science and mathematics teachers in the next ten years is expected to be over 33,000." (2007) A CSU president involved in this analysis noted that it meant that even if CSU and UC achieved their ambitious commitments to significantly increase the math and science teachers prepared, the state would still fall further behind every year. The 11-campus University System of Maryland, which produces hundreds of science, mathematics, and engineering graduates annually, last year produced only 46 secondary math and science teachers and only *one* physics teacher. A recent Georgia newspaper article discussing a new effort in that state to recruit science and mathematics teachers noted:

> In Georgia, out of 25,000 public college graduates in 2006, just three became high school physics teachers. Nine accepted jobs as chemistry teachers. It's a situation that will worsen in time. By 2010, Georgia will need more than 4,500 middle and high school math and science teachers, according to the University System of Georgia ("Teacher Recruitment Paying Off," *The Brunswick News*, March 13, 2008).

The immense challenge amidst this plethora of current initiatives is that even the most promising are not yet of sufficient scale to make a very significant impact. Although some institutions are making significant progress in addressing the needs of their states, most individual institutional responses remain somewhat tenuous. Universities, each acting alone, face daunting challenges in making the necessary institutional changes, and, as a community, have yet to develop the focus or drive to sustain a higher priority for preparing and developing science and math teachers. For faculty, it is difficult to learn from and build upon the initiatives at other institutions. For administrators, it is hard to address fundamental structural constraints—serious reforms in incentive and reward systems that would sustain a higher priority for teacher preparation and education partnerships, thus building them into the fabric of institutional culture. And overall, university efforts do not have sufficient visibility or credibility to prompt leaders from other sectors to create the necessary significant collaborations to make very major changes.

Working together, under the umbrella of this national initiative, we are a broad and engaged community of leading research institutions with unusual capacity and leverage to provide national leadership. We can build across and significantly empower the many ongoing fine efforts, and prompt collaborating attention by other key education, public and industrial sectors. Knitting together the drive and creativity of individual institutions responding to regional needs will stimulate the sustained institutional change necessary to make a significant and longstanding national difference.

MONTANA BOARD OF PUBLIC EDUCATION CERTIFICATION STANDARDS AND PRACTICES ADVISORY COUNCIL

B Y L A W S

ARTICLE I. NAME

The name of the organization shall be the Montana Certification Standards and Practices Advisory Council.

ARTICLE II. PURPOSE

The Montana Certification Standards and Practices Advisory Council, hereinafter referred to as the Council, has been formed in accordance with 2-15-1522 MCA, **pursuant to 2-15-122(10) MCA, the Council shall exist and be extended by the Board of Public Education on an interval period not to exceed two years**, and shall have as its purposes:

A. To study and make recommendations to the Board of Public Education in the following areas:

1. Teacher certification standards, including, but not limited to, precertification training and education requirements and certification renewal requirements and procedures;

2. Administrator certification standards, including, but not limited to, precertification training and education requirements and certification renewal requirements and procedures;

3. Specialist certification standards, including, but not limited to, precertification training and education requirements and certification renewal requirements and procedures;

4. Feasibility of establishing standards of professional practices and ethical conduct;

5. The status and efficacy of approved teacher education programs in Montana; and

6. Policies related to the denial, suspension, and revocation of teaching certification and the appeals process. For the purpose of preparing recommendations in this area, the Council is authorized to review the individual cases and files that have been submitted to the Board of Public Education.

B. To submit a written report with its recommendations annual and at other appropriate times to the Board of Public Education.

ARTICLE III. MEMBERSHIP

A. **Membership.** The Council shall consist of seven members appointed by a majority vote of the Board of Public Education. The membership must include:

1. Three teachers engaged in classroom teaching, including:

    a. one who teaches within kindergarten through grade 8;

    b. one who teaches within grade 9 through 12; and

    c. one additional teacher from any category in subsection (2) (a) or (2) (b) of 2-15-1522 MCA.

2. one person employed as a specialist or K-12 specialist;

3. one faculty member from an approved teacher education program offered by an accredited teacher education institution;

4. one person employed as an administrator, with the certification required in 20-4-106 (1) (c); and

5. one school district trustee.

B. **Tenure.**

1. The term of office of an appointed member is three years. If a vacancy occurs on the Council, the Board of Public Education shall appoint a person from the category of membership in which the vacancy occurred to serve the unexpired term. Regular appointments shall begin June 1 and end May 31 of the third year of the term.

2. Any member desiring to resign from the Council shall submit his/her resignation in writing to the Council and to the Board of Public Education.

C. **Compensation.** Council members are entitled to travel expenses incurred for each day of attendance at Council meetings or in the performance of any duty or service as a Council member in accordance with 2-18-501 through 2-18-503 MCA. Eligible Council members are also entitled to per diem for each day of attendance at Council meetings, not to exceed eight days per year, in accordance with 2-15-122 MCA.

D. In order to receive reimbursement or compensation for out-of-state activities, the Council member must obtain the approval of the Council Chairperson and the

Council Administrator in advance of undertaking the activity.

ARTICLE IV. MEETINGS

A. **Meetings.** The Council shall meet quarterly and at other times as may be required for the proper conduct of the business of the Council at the call of the chairperson. Such business may include, but not be limited to:

1. Information, discussion, and action on matters related to the purposes of the Council described in Article II;

2. Election of officers and appointments to committees as described in Article V;

3. Apprising the Board of Public Education of budgetary needs of the Council and making recommendations on a preliminary budget;

4. Reviewing Council Budget on an ongoing basis for further recommendations to the Board.

B. **Quorum.** A quorum for a meeting shall be not less than four Council members.

C. **Notice.** Each member of the Council shall be given written notice stating the place, day, and hour of any regularly scheduled meeting at least 10 calendar days prior to the meeting. It shall be delivered by mail to the last known address of each member.

D. **Absence.** Recognizing the value of his/her contribution to the business of the Council, each Council member shall be responsible to notify the chairperson in advance of any anticipated absence from a scheduled meeting. If a member is absent from three consecutive scheduled meetings, his/her membership shall be subject to review by the Board of Public Education to determine if the member's office shall be deemed vacant. If deemed vacant, the vacancy shall be filled in accordance with Article III, Section B.

E. **Special Meetings.** Special meetings may be called by the Chairperson of the Council or by a request in writing of two regular appointed members. When necessary the Council may hold meetings for resolution of specific agenda items either by a meeting in person, by conference call or by a combination of both. In the case of a special meeting, the administrative officer shall notify each regular member either by mail or by telephone sufficiently in advance of the meeting to allow all council members to travel to the meeting site from their principal Montana residence.

In the case of a conference call, forty-eight hours prior to the meeting shall be deemed sufficient notice.

F. **Meeting Procedure.**

1. Meetings of the Council shall be governed by the following rules:

    a. The chair or vice-chair shall preside at all meetings. In their absence, a temporary presiding officer shall be selected by the membership.

    b. The presiding officer shall neither introduce nor second a motion.

    c. A motion shall require a simple majority of those present to pass.

    d. Any motion shall be in order as long as no previous motion is on the floor.

    e. Minutes shall be taken at all open sessions of the Council. The minutes shall be made available for public inspection by the Board of Public Education, subject to reasonable regulation in the time and manner of inspection.

    f. The current edition of Robert's Rules of Order shall prevail on questions of parliamentary procedure.

2. The regular order of business shall be as follows:

    1. Call to order
    2. Roll Call
    3. Approval of the minutes of the preceding meeting
    4. Agenda adoption
    5. Agenda
    6. Date and place of next meeting
    7. Adjournment

3. An agenda shall set the structure for meetings of the Council.

    a. A tentative agenda shall be prepared as the last item of business by the Council at each regularly scheduled meeting.

    b. The tentative agenda may be modified by the membership through written notice at least 20 days prior to the meeting, at which time the tentative agenda, as modified, becomes the proposed agenda.

    c. The proposed agenda shall be included with the written notice of meeting required in Section C of this article.

d. Persons or organizations desiring to address the Council may be placed on the proposed agenda by making a written request to a member. The Council member will present the request to the chair to be considered at the time of approval of the proposed agenda.

e. The proposed agenda becomes the approved agenda by a majority vote of Council members at the beginning of the meeting.

f. Whenever possible, support materials for the agenda shall be in graphic and/or written form and readily available to the membership.

ARTICLE V. ORGANIZATION

Section A.
Officers.

1. The Council shall select, by majority vote, a chair and vice-chair from its appointed members annually during the spring meeting of each year.

2. The term of elective office shall be for one year and an officer may not serve more than two consecutive years.

3. The chair shall be the presiding officer and shall preside over all regular, special, and public meetings of the Council. The vice-chair shall perform the functions of the chair in the absence of the chair.

Section B.
Committees.

1. At the beginning of the chair's term, and as vacancies occur, the chair shall, with concurrence of a majority of the Council, appoint the committee chairs.

    a. The Pre-Professional Preparation and Development Committee will initiate studies and recommendations on precertification training and education requirements for teachers, administrators and specialists.

    b. The Licensure and Endorsement Committee will initiate studies and recommendations on types and alignments of certification and endorsements.

    c. The Montana Commission on Teaching will address issues critical to Montana's teaching profession in accordance with the Montana partnership agreement between the CSPAC and the National Commission on Teaching America's Future. The Board of Public

Education will administer funds allocated to the Montana Commission on Teaching.

2. The chair of the Montana Commission on Teaching must be a CSPAC member.

3. The Chair may appoint Special Committees as needed that will allow in-depth study of issues that are the responsibility of the standing committees.

4. The Executive Committee shall consist of the chair and vice-chair. The Executive Committee shall be responsible for presenting budgeting proposals to the Council and to the Board of Public Education. The Executive Committee shall be responsible for performing other duties as assigned by the chair or Council.

5. The committees will meet at times agreed upon by the majority of the committee. The Council Chair and Executive Secretary of the Board of Public Education shall be informed of the purpose, time and place of all committee meetings.

ARTICLE VI. ASSISTANCE

The Council may request research, administrative, and clerical staff assistance from the Board of Public Education.

ARTICLE VII. COMMUNICATIONS

These bylaws may be added to or amended by a two-thirds majority vote of the entire Certification Standards and Practices Advisory Council provided that the proposed amendment is sent in writing to all members of the Certification Standards and Practices Advisory Council at least seven days in advance.

DISTANCE LEARNING TASK FORCE
TIMELINE SUMMARY

September 14, 2006 — Distance Learning Task Force Established by the Board of Public Education

- The Board feels compelled to examine its on-line learning rules every two years because of the rapidly evolving field of technology

December 4, 2006 — Distance Learning Task Force Phase I (DLTFI) Meeting

- 20 members and 5 alternates of the Task Force were appointed by the Board because of its commitment to transparency and collaboration

December 15, 2006 — DLTFI Meeting

December 20, 2006 — DLTFI Sub-committee Meeting

- Because of the complexity of this issue and ramifications to school districts, the Board created sub-committee meetings

January 2, 2007 — DLTFI Sub-committee Meeting

January 6, 2007 — DLTFI Meeting

- Recommendation – Definition of asynchronous, synchronous, distance learning, on-line learning, and technology delivered learning
- Recommendation – Board of Trustees shall adopt policies addressing distance learning
- Recommendation – If a majority of coursework is taken on-line, the school shall report to OPI
- Recommendation – Teachers shall be licensed and endorsed in Montana in the area of instruction taught
- Recommendation – If teacher is not licensed, an on-site facilitator shall be licensed and endorsed in Montana

March 5, 2007 — Hearing Conducted on ARM rules 10.55.602, 10.55.701, and 10.55.907

- The majority of public testimony opposed the recommendations in the rule as noticed

May 11, 2007

Action Taken by Board of Public Education to Adopt Rules as Amended

- Board adopted rule as noticed, however, implemented a delayed effective date on the recommendations regarding teacher credentials until July 1, 2009

October 25, 2007

Distance Learning Task Force Phase II (DLTFII) Reconvened

- Board reconvened entire Task Force to address teacher licensure associated with on-line learning
- Issues to be considered included:
  - -New Class 8 Postsecondary License for K-12 On-line Learning
  - -Allow for licensure reciprocity with other states
  - -Issues of supplement/not supplant
  - -Issues related to fiscal matters

January 15, 2008

DLTFII Meeting

- Task Force created three working groups
  - -Class 8 Licensure
  - -Supplement/Supplant
  - -Fiscal

January 29, 2008

DLTFII Sub-committee Meeting

February 7, 2008

DLTFII Sub-committee Meeting

February 12, 2008

DLTFII Sub-committee Meeting

February 19, 2008

DLTFII Sub-committee Meeting

February 25, 2008

DLTFII Sub-committee Meeting

March 11, 2008

DLTFII Sub-committee Meeting

May 1, 2008

DLTFII Scheduled to Meet

- Task Force voted unanimously to forward to the Board, as a recommendation, revamped amendments to the Board's rules affecting on-line learning

May 8-9, 2008

Proposed Rules to BPE for Review

July 11, 2008

Action Taken by Board of Public Education to Notice Rules for Hearing

- 10.55.907 new language allows teachers to be licensed and endorsed in Montana or elsewhere

- 10.57.102 and 10.57.201 create a new Class 8 Dual Credit Only Postsecondary Faculty License and create definitions prescribing Class 8

July 21, 2008 Proposed Notices to Secretary of State for Notice in MAR

July 31, 2008 MAR Publication Out

August 26, 2008 Hearing Date

August 28, 2008 Final Public Input Deadline

September 12, 2008 Proposed Adoption Notice to Board of Public Education for Review

September 15, 2008 Final Rule Changes to Secretary of State for Notice in MAR

September 25, 2008 MAR Publication Out

September 26, 2008 Effective Date of Rules

- Work which will remain after rules become effective pertain to 10.57.102 (1)(a)(ii) "verification of the education attainment level and experience appropriate and required for the discipline and the institution"
- Beginning fall semester 2009, all postsecondary instructors of dual-credit courses will be required to hold an active teaching license – Class 1, Class 2, Class 4, or Class 8 license. The Office of Public Instruction will provide guidance and technical assistance to interested postsecondary faculty on the application and approval process to implement Class 8
- This work will be accomplished by the development of a rubric to evaluate each applicant by a committee appointed by the Board of Public Education

Master's of Education (M.Ed.) in Curriculum & Instruction

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
EDUCATION, HEALTH & HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Professional Educator Option ~ Offered as a 100% on-line program of study

Signature Content ~ 9 credits

- EDCI 531 Contemporary Issues in Education
- EDCI 504 Assessment & Evaluation in Education
- EDCI 5XX Mentoring New Teachers

Research ~ 3 credits

- EDCI 506 Applied Educational Research

Content Area ~ 15 credits

Elementary Teachers (Choose 5)

- EDCI 534 Literacy Assessment & Instruction
- EDCI 510 Issues & Trends in Social Studies Instruction
- EDCI 525 Improvement of Instruction in Science
- MATH 521 Theory of Learning Mathematics
- EDCI 520 Visual Arts & Learning
- EDCI 551 Educational Technology: Creative Integration

Secondary Teachers

- Choose 5 courses relevant to your content area

K-12 Music Teachers

- MUED 504 History & Analysis
- MUED 530 Foundations of Music Education
- MUED 532 Research & Practice
- Choose one:
  - MUED 540-01 Advanced Choral Conducting*
  - MUED 540-02 Advanced Instrumental Conducting*
  - MUED 5XX General Music Practicum*
- Choose one:
  - MUED 5XX Technology in the Music Classroom*
  - MUED 542-01 Graduate Vocal Pedagogy*
  - MUED 542-02 Graduate Instrumental Pedagogy*

*Offered as hybrid online summer courses requiring work both online and in face-to-face meetings on the MSU campus.

Capstone Experience ~ 3 credits (choose from the following)

- EDCI 564 Comprehensive Portfolio
- EDCI 575 Professional Paper/Project

Educational Research Option

Signature Content ~ 9 credits (choose from the following)

- EDCI 402 Statistics I
- EDCI 506 Applied Educational Research
- EDCI 507 Qualitative Methods for Educational Research
- EDCI 607 Quantitative Methods In Educational Research

Content Area ~ 12 credits

- Choose 4 courses appropriate to your area of specialization

Thesis ~ 9 credits

- EDCI 590 Master's Thesis

Technology Education Option

Signature Content ~ 19 Credits

• TE 410	Advanced CAD/CAM	3 credits
• TE 500	Seminar	1 credit
• TE 501	History & Philosophy of Technology Education	3 credits
• TE 530	3D Modeling & Animation	3 credits
• EDCI 532	General School Curriculum	3 credits
• EDCI 555	Instructional Design, Learning, and Technology	3 credits
• Elective		3 credits

Internship ~ 8 Credits

• EDCI 558	Internship - Classroom	3 credits
• TE 476	Internship - Industry	3 credits
• EDCI 571	In-Service	2 credits

Capstone ~ 3 Credits

• EDCI 575	Professional Paper/Project	3 credits

EDCI 580-01
Mentoring New Teachers
3 Credits
Fall 2008

Instructor: Jayne Downey, Ph.D.
Office: 120 Reid Hall
Office Phone: 994–7426
Email: jdowney@montana.edu

Course Description
This course examines key issues, skills, and research relevant to the process of mentoring new teachers and supporting them in their development from survival to being successful classroom teachers with an enhanced commitment to the profession of education.. Course content includes identifying interpersonal skills and attributes necessary for successful mentoring, analyzing professional development needs and strategies for progress, and developing the use of observation and other tools for monitoring and evaluation.

Goals
Upon completion of this course, you should be able to:

1. Identify the role and benefits of serving as a teacher mentor
2. Describe the needs of initial educators, educator standards, and benefits of a mentoring program for the initial educator and the school district
3. Assess the characteristics and behaviors of effective mentors in providing observation, support, assistance, and feedback during observing and conferencing
4. Identify potential problems that are likely to occur in a mentoring relationship and define effective responses to these problems
5. Identify best practices for creating and maintaining a safe environment for the mentee to attain and sustain a mastery level of teaching with an active and positive learning environment that supports school, district, and state curricula
6. Design a working professional development plan for mentoring new teachers including self-reflection, goal setting, identified activities, timelines, evidence of collaboration, and an assessment plan.

Required Texts
Jonson, K. (2008). *Being an effective mentor: How to help beginning teachers succeed.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Hicks, C., Glasgow, N., & McNary, S. (2005) *What successful mentors do: 81 research-based strategies for new teacher induction, training, and support.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Additional readings are identified below in the **Course Outline**.

Academic Expectations
1. **Plagiarism -** Paraphrasing or quoting another's work without citing the source is a form of academic misconduct. Even inadvertent or unintentional misuse or appropriation of another's work (such as relying heavily on source material that is not expressly acknowledged) is considered plagiarism. If you have any questions about using and citing sources, you are expected to ask for clarification.

2. **Collaboration -** University policy states that, unless otherwise specified, students may not collaborate on graded material. Any exceptions to this policy will be stated explicitly for individual assignments. If you have any questions about the limits of collaboration, you are expected to ask for clarification.
3. **Behavior -** Section 310.00 in the MSU Conduct Guidelines states that students must:
   - submit required assignments in a timely manner;
   - act in a respectful manner toward other students and the instructor and in a way that does not detract from the learning experience.
4. **Students with Disabilities -** If you have a documented disability for which you are or may be requesting an accommodation(s), please contact me and Disabled Student Services as soon as possible.
5. **Additional Information** – Go to http://www2.montana.edu/policy/student_conduct/cg600.html.

Time Commitment Expectations

- A typical face-to-face 3 credit hour graduate course meets for 3 hours/week (for 15 weeks) with an expectation of 6-9 hours/week of additional work outside of class time.
- This makes the total time involvement for a semester to be approximately 135–180 hours of work for a 3 credit course.
- Since our course will be compressed into a 8 week format, you can expect to spend 17–22 hours/week working on course-related learning this semester.

Course Requirements

1. **Summary & Reflection of Reading** **100 points**

   The course outline identifies the required reading for each week. You will be expected to complete the assigned reading, videos, and/or website explorations on time and using WebCT's Discussion Tool post a 2 page summary and reflection pertaining to the reading, video, and web material. Your summary is to end with at least 2 well-written questions and/or issues you wish to discuss with your classmates. Please formulate questions that are high-level, integrative, reflective, and grounded in the literature and try to avoid creating factual questions (e.g., What was Piaget's wife's name?).

   Your Weekly Summary & Reflections (12.5 points/week) will be evaluated according to their adherence to the following standards:

   - Thoughtful summary of assigned reading.
   - Presence of meaningful questions for class discussion.
   - Professional presentation ~ APA format, organization, spelling, grammar, length.

2. Discussion Posts **200 points**

Each week, you will be expected to respond to your classmates' questions. The responses you post are an important part of the class. They will enable you to engage with each other and the material in a deeper way. Your posts can serve to focus what you already know, as well as provide additional insights and points of view. This type of interaction will allow you to share your ideas with your classmates in a manner not always possible in a typical face-to-face classroom situation. You are expected to make a minimum of two response entries each week. In general, longer entries (e.g., 100+ words; 7-8 sentences) are better than short entries (less than 100 words), in order to more fully develop your thoughts, insights, ideas, etc.

Your Weekly Discussion Posts (25 points/week) will be evaluated according to their adherence to the following standards:

- At least one thoughtful response to classmates' questions.
- Carefully constructed posts pertaining to the week's learning activity.
- Professional presentation ~ APA format, organization, spelling, grammar, length.

3. Case Study Project **75 points**

For this project, you will be asked to collaborate with a partner as you select, discuss, and analyze 3 *Mentoring New Teacher Case Studies* from the selection of cases provided. Following the Case Study Project Guidelines, each pair will submit a 2 page written analysis of each case and using current literature and research, offer a recommended response for the issues raised in the case.

The first case study analysis will be due Nov. 8; the second will be due Nov. 15; and the third will be due Nov. 22.

Your papers will be evaluated according to adherence to the following standards:

- Clear summary of the issues presented in the case.
- Identification of specific strategies to address the issues.
- Current literature is provided to support each core idea.
- Professional presentation ~ APA format, organization, spelling, grammar, length.

The Case Studies, Guidelines and additional information about the paper will be provided under the WebCT Assignments Tool.

4. Best Practices in Mentoring New Teachers Project **125 points**

For this project you will select a minimum of 5 topic areas relevant to Mentoring New Teachers. Examples of appropriate topics include but are not limited to: clinical supervision techniques in the classroom such as observation, conferencing, and reflection; mentoring activities such as co-teaching, videotaping, peer coaching; problem-solving; strategies to build reflective practitioners (journals, portfolios, support/discussion groups, questioning techniques); providing support for mentors; building mentee content knowledge; strengthening lesson planning, delivery, and

assessment; classroom organization and management; knowledge of learners; personal and professional qualities such as record-keeping or organizational skills.

You will develop a 1-2 page executive summary of what the field recognizes as best practice in each of your chosen topic areas and provide an annotated list of at least 5 current resources from websites, research journal articles, and text resources that will support mentors and beginning teachers' development in each topic area. As you develop the executive summary and annotated bibliography for each topic, please address the following key questions: What does an effective teacher need to know and do? What is the role of the mentor in the development of these skills and competencies? How does the presence/absence of these skills impact new teacher success?

This project will be due December 6.

Your paper will be evaluated according to adherence to the following standards:

- Thoughtfully constructed executive summary for each topic addressing the key questions outlined above.
- Well-written annotation for at least 5 resources under each topic.
- Professional presentation ~ APA format, organization, spelling, grammar, length.

Additional information about the paper will be provided under the WebCT Assignments Tool.

5. Design a Mentoring Program **200 points**

During the first years of their careers, beginning teachers have serious learning needs. According to Feiman-Nemser (2001) beginning teachers need to:

- Gain local knowledge of students, curriculum and the school context;
- Design responsive curriculum and instruction;
- Enact and build their teaching repertoire in purposeful ways;
- Create a classroom learning community;
- Develop a professional identity;
- Learn in and from practice.

In this project, your assignment is to design a Mentoring Program for new teachers in your school and/or district that addresses their learning needs through a planned purposeful effort to support the development of the necessary knowledge, instructional skills, and commitment to students' learning. Your Mentoring Program plan should address:

- The current mentoring needs of your school or district
- A description of program goals and outcomes with literature support
- A description of the elements of your program with literature support
- A description of funding and incentives or compensation with literature support
- A set of organized resources
- A program evaluation rubric

This project will be due December 13 and will be evaluated according to adherence to the following standards:

- Thorough description of current school/district needs.
- Critical synthesis of literature and chosen goals, outcomes, program elements, and compensation.
- Development of appropriate program evaluation rubric
- Professional presentation ~ APA format, organization, spelling, grammar, length.

Additional information about the paper will be provided under the WebCT Assignments Tool.

Summary of Requirements and Points

Requirements	**Points**
Weekly Summary/Reflection	100
Discussion Posts	200
Case Study Project	75
Best Practices Project	125
Program Design Project	200
Total	700

Letter Grade Equivalents	
A	651 & above
A-	630-650
B+	609-629
B	581-608
B-	560-580
C+	539-559
C	511-538
C-	490-510
D+	469-489
D	441-468
D-	420-440
F	439 & below

Proposed Course Outline (this schedule will be modified if needed)

Week 1 (Oct 27-Nov 1) The role and benefits of serving as a teacher mentor	**If this is your first Online Learning Experience ...** • Read the documents under *WebCT's Welcome to Online Learning Tool* • Learn how to use *WebCT's Course Materials Tool* ... Read the Overview Document • Learn how to use *WebCT's Syllabus Tool* ... Read EDCI 580 Syllabus • Learn how to use *WebCT's Email Tool* ...Send an individual email to professor **Reading** • Text: Jonson pgs. 1-36 • Strong, M. (2005). *Mentoring new teachers to increase retention* (Research Brief No. 05-01). Santa Cruz, CA: New Teacher Center. • Villar, A. & Stobbe, C. (2005). Researching the domains of mentor development: The transition from veteran classroom teachers to formal mentor status. Paper presented at the New Teacher Center Symposium, University of California, Santa Cruz, CA. **Discussion** • Using *WebCT's Discussion Tool* ... Post a short biography to share with class & respond to your classmates • Post Reading Summary & Reflective Questions • Post a minimum of two responses to your classmates' questions
Week 2 (Nov 2-8) The needs of initial educators and benefits of a mentoring program	**Reading** • Text: Jonson pgs. 37-94 • Smith, T. & Ingersoll, R. (2004). What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover? *American Education Research Journal, 41*, 3, 681-714. • Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research, 54*, 2, 143-178. • Ganser, T. (1999). Areas of advice seeking among beginning teachers in a mentoring program. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. **Discussion** • Post Reading Summary & Reflective Questions • Post a minimum of two responses to your classmates' questions **Writing** • Case Study Analysis 1

Week 3 (Nov 9-15) The characteristics and behaviors of effective mentors -- observation, support, and assistance	**Reading** • Text: Jonson pgs. 95-152 • Text: Hicks pgs. 1-26 • Ganser, T. (1995). What are the concerns and questions of mentors of beginning teachers. *NASSP Bulletin,* 79, 83-91. • Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record, 103*, 6, 1013-1055. **Discussion** • Post Reading Summary & Reflective Questions • Post a minimum of two responses to your classmates' questions **Writing** • Case Study Analysis 2
Week 4 (Nov 16-22) The characteristics and behaviors of effective mentors -- providing feedback and dealing with challenges and difficulties that arise	**Reading** • Text: Jonson pgs.153-166 • Strong, M., Fletcher, S., & Villar, A. (2008.) An investigation of the effects of variations in mentor-based induction on the performance of students in California. *Teachers College Record,* in press. • Achinstein, B. & Ogawa, R. (2006). (In)fidelity: What new teacher resistance reveals about professional principles and prescriptive educational policies. *Harvard Educational Review, 76*, 1, p30-63. **Discussion** • Post Reading Summary & Reflective Questions • Post a minimum of two responses to your classmates' questions **Writing** • Case Study Analysis 3
Week 5 (Nov 23-29) Best practices for creating and maintaining an active and positive mentoring environment	**Reading** • Text: Hicks pgs. 27-94 • Strong, M. & Baron, W. (2004). An analysis of mentoring conversations with beginning teachers: Suggestions and responses. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 20*, 1, 47-57. **Discussion** • Post Reading Summary & Reflective Questions • Post a minimum of two responses to your classmates' questions

Week 6 (Nov 30-Dec 6) Best practices for creating and maintaining an active and positive mentoring environment.	**Reading** • Text: Hicks pgs. 95-188 • Athanases, S. & Achinstein, B. (2003). Focusing new teachers on individual and low performing students: The centrality of assessment in the mentor's repertoire of practice. *Teachers College Record, 105*, 8, 1486–1520. **Discussion** • Post Reading Summary & Reflective Questions • Post a minimum of two responses to your classmates' questions **Writing** • Best Practices Project
Week 7 (Dec 7-13) Designing a professional development plan for mentoring new teachers	**Reading** • Text: Jonson pgs.167-196 • Ingersoll, R. & Kralik, J. (2004). *The impact of mentoring on teacher retention: What the research says*. Denver, CO: The Education Commission of the States. **Discussion** • Post Reading Summary & Reflective Questions • Post a minimum of two responses to your classmates' questions **Writing** • Design a Mentoring Program Project
Week 8 (**Dec 14-19**) Designing a professional development plan for mentoring new teachers	**Reading** • Johnson, S. & Kardos, S. (2004). Professional culture and the promise of colleagues. In S. M. Johnson (Ed.), *Finders and keepers: Helping new teachers survive and thrive in our schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. **Discussion** • Post Reading Summary & Reflective Questions • Post a minimum of two responses to your classmates' questions

DRAFT

Mentor Teacher Permissive Special Competency

Dr. Jayne Downey
Montana State University
October 3, 2008

The Mentor Teacher permissive special competency program requires that successful candidates:

1. Demonstrate knowledge of the role and benefits of serving as a teacher mentor
2. Demonstrate knowledge of the needs of initial educators and educator standards
3. Demonstrate knowledge of the benefits of a mentoring program for the initial educator and the school district
4. Demonstrate knowledge of the characteristics and behaviors of effective mentors in providing observation, support, and assistance
5. Demonstrate knowledge of the characteristics and behaviors of effective mentors in providing feedback during observing and conferencing
6. Demonstrate knowledge of the potential problems that can occur in a mentoring relationship and define effective responses to these problems
7. Demonstrate knowledge of best practices for creating and maintaining a safe environment for the mentee to attain and sustain a mastery level of teaching with an active and positive learning environment that supports school, district, and state curricula
    - Support new teacher growth toward meeting the learning needs of every child
    - Support new teacher growth toward incorporating IEFA into their curricular offerings
8. Demonstrate knowledge of the elements of a school or district professional development plan for mentoring new teachers including self-reflection, goal setting, identified activities, timelines, evidence of collaboration, and an assessment plan.

Possible Coursework for Mentor Teacher PSC ~ 21 credits

- EDCI 531 Contemporary Issues in Education
- EDCI 504 Assessment and Evaluation in Education
- EDCI 5XX Mentoring New Teachers
- EDCI 506 Applied Educational Research
- EDCI 575 Professional Paper/Project
- EDCI 576 Internship I – Mentoring New Teachers I
- EDCI 576 Internship II – Mentoring New Teachers II

OPI Linda McCulloch, Superintendent
Montana Office of Public Instruction
www.opi.mt.gov

School Administrators of Montana SAM

MEA-MFT
Public Schools, Public Service

Setting up a Mentoring Program in a School District
Suggested Timeline/Activities

The timelines suggested below are guidelines and can be adapted to meet the specific need of each district. Districts may want to consider starting the planning process earlier in the school year to avoid the end-of-year crunch.

Year Prior to Implementation of Mentor Program

January

- School or district leadership team, including teacher union leadership, view PowerPoint on Best Practices in Mentoring developed by the Office of Public Instruction (OPI).
- Discuss possible number of new teachers for following year and mentor program development.
- Identify a temporary mentor coordinator for the implementation of the district mentor program.
- Contact OPI regarding mentor training opportunities or potential mentor trainer for the initial implementation.

February

- School Board Meeting – introduce temporary mentor coordinator, view and discuss the PowerPoint presentation on Best Practices in Mentoring.
- School Board, superintendent and teacher union representatives (in districts where collective bargaining does not exist, include teacher representatives) – set up a committee (including School Board representative, administration, and teachers) to jointly develop Mentor Program Guidelines and begin to discuss program implementation.

March

- Bargain appropriate contract language or memoranda for mentoring program. This may require a memorandum of agreement in those school communities with ongoing, multi-year negotiated agreements.
- Have School Board approval of Mentor Program.

April

- Building principals and union leaders discuss the new program with teachers at affected school sites.
- Ask for interested teachers to apply, following the Mentor Program guidelines and the bargained agreement.

May

Select teachers for training to participate as mentors.

Spring – Summer

Inform newly hired teachers that they will participate in Mentor Program and share guidelines of the program.

June

- Send a team of three to the Teacher Mentor Trainer Institute, or find an alternative option for training the mentor program trainers.
- Set up training schedule with mentor trainer for following year, corresponding with the already established Mentor Program guidelines.

Year One of Implementation

Based on setting up five to six training sessions, three hours each, for teacher.

Early August

- Hold a planning meeting for mentor trainers to reflect on activities and the district mentor program guidelines.
- Match mentors and protégés.
- Set up introductory meeting for teams prior to beginning of school.
- Add a day, following the bargained agreement and mentoring program guidelines, for mentors and protégés to work together and begin training with Mentor Trainers.

September

Mentor Training in skills of consulting, collaborating, and coaching.

November

Mentor Training in skills of goal setting, planning, problem solving, and reflecting.

January

- Mentor Training in verbal skills and supportive language.
- Discuss possible number of new teachers for following year and how many mentors may be needed.

April

Mentor training in skills of developing a professional vision of learning for protégés.

May

- Meetings set up with mentors and protégés to evaluate program for first year. Include members of committee who developed the program to review guidelines and make any changes for next year.
- Open up opportunities for additional staff for mentor training.

June

- Send original three members of the trainer team to the Refresher Teacher Mentor Trainer Institute.
- If additional trainers are needed send personnel to the full Teacher Mentor Trainer Institute.

SHORT TERM CSPAC GOALS

- **NCTQ report**
  - **looking at a couple areas each meeting possibly having someone come in and speak to the Council about those areas**
  - **possibly writing a letter about the positives**
- **Possible research into Braille instructors, certification, barriers, etc.**
- **Distance-learning**
- **Dual-enrollment**
- **Chapter 57 review**
- **Mentoring research and program-planning**